SMITH'S REPORT

Number 17 Spring 1994

Bradley R. Smith, Director
Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust
Post Office Box 3267 Visalia, California 93278
Telephone: (209) 627 8757 Fax: (209) 733 2653

BACKSTAGE WITH PHIL DONAHUE -- WILLIS CARTO VERSUS IHR, ANDREW ALLEN & HIMSELF

Smith's Report *now includes* ***Campus Update--for Editors.*** ***Update*** *is distributed free to the editors of 350 campus newspapers five times a year. For the first time, a revisionist connection is maintained with college and university newspapers.* ***Update*** *is also distributed free, with other background, to news and feature editors at 150 dailies, weeklies and monthlies.*

CODOH AD RUNS IN 35 COLLEGE PAPERS!

The CODOH advertisement challenging the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum to display proof that homicidal gassing chambers existed anywhere in Europe during World War II has appeared in at least 35 campus newspapers this academic year. We had no way to know in the fall that we would be so successful.

Here are the campuses where the Museum ad ran after my last listing here. U of Rhode Island (4 February), California State U at Chico (9 March), San Jose State U (9 March), Humbolt State U (CA, 16 March), American River College (CA, 17 March), Southern Illinois U (Carbondale, 7 April), U of Miami (12 April), SUNY-Oneonta NY (14 April), Trenton State U (14 [?] April), Manhattan College (Long Island, 14 April), SUNY-Buffalo (The Pipedream, 15 April), Clemson U (16 April), Columbia College (Chicago IL, 18 April), SUNY-Potsdam NY (19 April), Central Florida State U (20 April), U of Maine (20 April), Hofstra U (21 April).

Four SUNY (State University of New York) papers ran the ad at three campuses. The Record at SUNY-Buffalo started the year off when it ran the text of the ad as an opinion piece on 28 September. The Pipedream at SUNY-Buffalo ran it as a paid ad on 15 April.

I received a note from Clemson U saying The Tiger ran the text of the ad as a letter to the editor. In a new development, I have begun receiving communications from advertising and editorial staff at campus newspapers providing me with behind-the-scenes information about what went on at their papers during the controversy over the ad. What appears in print in the campus press is only the tip of the iceberg.

There may have been other publications of the ad that I have been unable to confirm. If you have information about the ad appearing or being discussed in the campus press, or anywhere else, please pass that information on to me.

MEDIA TRAIL TO THE PHIL DONAHUE SHOW

When the Museum ad ran on 7 December at **Brandeis University**, where the student body is about 75% Jewish, the resulting fuss got the attention of the prestige press and network media. That press led directly to my being interviewed by **Time** magazine and the full-page article on the Campus Project and Brandeis that ran in the issue of 27 December. While the **Time** article was amateurish and uninformed, it did introduce revisionism and CODOH to a national audience of tens of millions of readers!

The **Time** article convinced the producers for **Mike Wallace** that the Campus Project should play a significant part in a **60 Minutes** segment. When the segment did air, Wallace featured the Campus Project--he had to say that Bradley Smith had "declined to be interviewed on camera"--and **Ernst Zuendel**.

60 Minutes used archival footage from an old **48 Hours** interview to include me briefly in the segment, and used other archival material from an old **Montel Williams** interview to include **David Cole** (who had walked away from the segment with me) and **Mark Weber**. The archival footage was pretty well chosen and did not attempt to mislead the viewer, which rather surprised me. Nevertheless, when the full segment was aired (on 13 February), I was happy with our decision to walk away from the interview.

Ernst told me that while he had hoped for more he had gotten about what he'd expected from 60 Minutes. Three or four minutes air time culled from a 100-minute interview, camera work that was intended to make him appear menacing and untrustworthy, and a cut and paste job that denigrated his extensive knowledge of revisionist scholarship while presenting his point of view in an unflattering light. He wasn't complaining. "I knew I was going to be the sacrificial lamb," he told me. "I was prepared for it. But I have my own plan. We'll see who gets sacrificed in

the end."

While the Mike Wallace people were getting background for their segment on "revisionism," the editorial staff of the **Queens College Quad** on Long Island NY was wrestling with its conscience over whether to run the Museum ad or not. It's possible that the attention they were getting from the 60 Minutes camera team, which filmed the open debate by The Quad editors, influenced them to stand on principle. When The Quad ran the ad it was the first time I had broken through into print in the belly of the beast itself--New York City!

After walking away from the Wallace interview, we were apprehensive about getting another shot at network TV. Behind the scenes, however, the news of our having turned down Mike Wallace was flashing from one TV producer's office to another. Within ten days people for **The Phil Donahue Show** were on the horn to me. Brandeis, Time magazine, Queens College and the Mike Wallace affair, all tied into the Campus Project and the growing controversy over the Holocaust Museum, was just too scandalous a story for Donahue to overlook.

David and I did the Donahue interview on 14 February, a Monday afternoon. It was aired in some markets on one-hour delay, in secondary markets during the rest of that week, and on the 21st it was aired in major markets including New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and Miami.

On balance, it was a very successful interview for revisionism. Donahue noted at the outset that the Holocaust Museum and Simon Wiesenthal Center people all refused to participate. He screened several minutes' footage from David Cole's upcoming new video, **The Gas Chambers: A Look at the Physical Evidence**, while David did a voice-over to explain what was being viewed. The Zyklon-B staining in the *disinfestation* chambers showed up as a brilliant blue, while scenes from the interior of a Mauthausen "homicidal" gassing chamber were shown to be a pristine white. Many of the 8 to 13 *million* viewers may not have understood the significance of this footage, but tens and maybe hundreds of thousands did.

David grew frustrated with Donahue for allowing a photograph of a Dachau shower room to represent a homicidal gas chamber, and frustrated with professor Michael Shermer for trivializing the significance of revisionist research, and during the half-hour commercial break he walked off the show. David had pressed Donahue hard on air, the audience was largely Jewish, and when Donahue came on stage after the commercial and announced "we have lost David Cole," the audience cheered and clapped. When you see it on screen it's comic.

While I thought David had completed an interesting maneuver when he walked off the set, afterwards he apologized for leaving me on stage alone to face a hostile audience. In his frustration he hadn't thought about that part of it. But it was all the same to me. Events were moving fast and I had my hands full with six or eight women (some had their bad-tempered daughters with them) in the front row who were in my face on camera and especially off, showing me their tattoos and castigating me as only some of those old harridans can. But most everything I've done with this work in public I've done alone. I'm used to it. In that sense it was just another day for me.

Dr. Shermer felt differently. He was sweating like a lathered horse. Everyone was attacking me but Shermer was doing the sweating. It must be agony for a man like that when his wife is having a baby. Every time a commercial was aired the make-up woman had to run out, mop Shermer's brow and make him up again.

Now that David was backstage, he could report to me afterwards a little of what was going on off-camera. Donahue was shouting at his producer to prod Shermer into action to destroy the revisionists, which was the role he had been assigned to play in our little drama, but the producer couldn't get Shermer to act. On the one hand he was sweating and on the other he was frozen. Even the make-up woman was encouraging Shermer to "get" us. The professor did manage to say on air that the Jewish soap story is not true (in spite of the survivor in the front row who hadn't wanted to wash during her stay at Auschwitz because she hadn't wanted to risk using the remains of her mommy that way).

In the final minute, of what had become a raucous program, Donahue stated on network television that the revisionists can no longer be ignored and that their arguments must be addressed. Let's give credit where credit's due. Donahue is the first nationally recognized figure to have said it on network TV. Back home in Visalia I wrote him making that observation, and noting that he had stood on firm liberal principle --intellectual freedom--and that he should feel some satisfaction with that. I can only imagine some of the guff he was taking behind the scenes. It must have been spectacular.

When the show ended the producer suggested that David and I stay around and chat up the audience but I said I didn't think so. We left immediately, following our guide through a back passageway and outside to the waiting limousines. David and I barely had time to say goodby before he was off to the airport.

I was to stay another night. When I was dropped off at my hotel I walked over to First Avenue then started north toward Elaine's restaurant and bar. I was happy. I was laughing. I had just pulled off a real coup. A revisionist breakthrough at the national level. The interview had gone well enough. It could have been a disaster and it hadn't been--it had gone off really quite well. Moreover it had confirmed for me that I had been right about the audience. At this stage of the game the audience is in the way. We don't need to do anymore shouting at that collective brute. We need to find a way to get the other side to argue the evidence.

No more media interviews then that are not live. No media interviews with audience participation. Take it or leave it.

The Mike Wallace segment aired the night of 13 February. The Donahue Show with David and me ran the afternoon of the 14th. It was a one-two revisionist punch. When I contemplate what our friends with the ADL, Hillel, the AJC, WJC, SWC, etc. etc. were talking about Monday night, I can't keep a grin off my face. When I think about what they were saying about revisionism's Mr. Donahue, the grin does an evil jig.

WILLIS CARTO AND THE "PROBLEMS"

Last year when the Board of Directors of IHR (for those of you who are new, The Institute for Historical Review) decided to fire its founder, I had to make a decision just like everybody else. Despite the absolutely crucial role Willis Carto played in founding IHR, once

irreconcilable editorial differences arose between WC and the staff, I chose to go with the staff. More precisely, I chose to go with The Journal of Historical Review.

From the beginning, my association with IHR has been contingent on what is published in The Journal. For me, IHR *is* The Journal, a dozen or so books published by IHR, and the rallying point it provides for the handful of revisionist scholars and researchers who have contributed to them, and for those who have supported the endeavor financially or in other ways. But my association with IHR has always pivoted around the contents and editorial policies of The Journal.

I never committed myself to any personality connected with the Institute, but to the Institute as represented by its publications. I didn't commit myself to Tom Marcellus (Marcellus was director in July 1984 when the Institute was burned to the ground in an arson attack, which was the event that propelled me into offering my services to the Institute) or any other director before or after Marcellus, or to Willis Carto. When I decided to associate myself with the Institute I didn't know Tom well and I didn't know Willis at all. As a matter of fact, I still don't know Willis.

My understanding of my loyalties and responsibilities toward revisionism and the Institute are the same today as they were ten years ago. I'll stand with The Journal so long as it publishes valuable revisionist research on the holocaust controversy, and I'll stop representing it when it becomes a forum for other interests.

While I've never been on staff at IHR, over the years I have come to know most of those associated with it in any meaningful way. In all those years there has never been a time when staff did not expend much of its energies in resisting WC's editorial influence. There has never been an editor for The Journal who did not have to struggle day by day, month after month all these years against what they have regarded as WC's psychological and intellectual vagaries.

McCalden, Stimely, Hoffman, Berkel, O'Keefe and Weber. Every one of them struggled against WC to maintain the intellectual integrity of The Journal. In the end each quit in disgust, or was fired, with the exception of Weber, who it appears Carto was preparing to try to get fired when he was fired himself.

The vulgarity and carelessness of Carto's intellectual style is represented by his national weekly, The Spotlight. It was always a commonplace at the Institute that if WC's editorial and intellectual sensibilities were ever to be successful, The Journal would become "another Spotlight," intellectually cheap, untrustworthy, the political tool of a single personality. I'm not saying The Spotlight runs no worthwhile stories, or that it has no place in the newspaper world. It does. But it's "another" world. It isn't mine. And it isn't the world of any revisionist scholar or researcher who wants his work to be taken seriously.

All of us who were privy to the struggle for editorial control of The Journal understood it was a life and death struggle for its intellectual integrity--against its founder.

Unlike those few supporters of IHR whose first loyalty is to Willis Carto, mine is to the Institute represented primarily by The Journal. Revisionist scholarship plays a key role in the struggle for intellectual freedom in America. The Journal is more important to me than Willis, and more important than any individual employed to edit it. If I were to conclude that the editor of The Journal had begun to compromise it, even if he were my friend, I would back the search for a new editor. I understand I don't have the ability to edit the Journal. I would not think it dishonorable to reach the same conclusion about a friend, if such were the case.

Loyalty to a friend does not imply to me that I should pretend my friend can perform a task he cannot, or that I should stand aside while he contributes to the dissolution of an institution I believe is necessary. I have no obligation to my friend and his ideals that he does not have toward me and mine.

So when it was time to decide between WC and the Journal, I chose The Journal hands down. It was no contest. My only regret is that it took so long for the time to come.

W. CARTO VS. ANDREW ALLEN

On 1 March I received a note from Willis stating in part, "I'm not sure if the facts are important to you, but if your mind is not totally closed and perhaps [you] even have some questions, why don't you ask me?"

I responded, admitting that I had failed to ask him for his side of the story but that I was certainly ready and willing to listen to it. Meanwhile, IHR had sent out a mailing with quotes from six well-known revisionists along with their photos, each, without mentioning Willis, endorsing the current staff of IHR. The six included Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz, David Irving, James J. Martin, Ernst Zuendel and myself.

In addition to endorsing the staff, I am quoted addressing the charge Willis is making in The Spotlight against my friend, Andrew Allen. Willis is charging that Allen works for the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and that because he is a member of the "new" IHR board of directors, the ADL now controls and runs IHR. My statement addresses this specific charge only. In it I promise that if it is ever demonstrated that Andrew Allen is an agent for the ADL, I will fly to Washington, call a press conference, and eat my shorts on the steps of Liberty Lobby (the parent company of The Spotlight).

A couple weeks later I received Willis's reply to my inquiry about his side of the story. It was a little package of canned materials that is sent to anyone who writes The Spotlight asking for it. There was a one-sentence penned note from Willis. "The next time you come to Washington," it read, "I suggest you wear clean shorts."

When I'm drinking beer I might think a crack like that is uproarious. I might even *make* a crack like that and slap my leg too. But Willis can do *better*. One day four or five years ago I got a note from Willis out of the blue. "I have good news for you," it read. "Your friend David McCulden is dying of AIDS." Now *there's* a funny line. We weren't even having an exchange of correspondence, Willis and me, yet he had taken the time to sit down, write and fold the note, address the envelope, put the note in it, lick it closed, stamp it and see that it got mailed.

At the time, I didn't have it in me to laugh at the news. Sometimes I'm just not at my best. As a matter of fact, when I read the note, I felt something terrible surge through my innards. Now that McCalden's death is well behind me and my too-easily touched sensibilities have relaxed about his demise, I can better appreciate WC's sense of the comic.

I am not amused, however, by WC's charge that my friend Andrew Allen is a mole for the ADL. When I got Willis's

package I looked for what proof he has in it to substantiate the charge. The matter is addressed on page (panel) seven of Vince Ryan's "Regarding the IHR Controversy."

According to Ryan, who is editor of The Spotlight and in this instance WC's mouthpiece, after the Carto/McCalden split in 1980, McCalden began to collaborate with Roy Bullock, an ADL undercover agent. Ryan writes that Bullock was McCalden's "handler," financing and directing him, while Andrew Allen collaborated closely with both McCalden "and Bullock."

Two years ago The San Francisco Chronicle exposed Bullock as a paid informant for the ADL. That much is true. But Ryan/WC present no proof whatever that Bullock was McCalden's "handler," that he financed or directed McCalden, and [my particular interest here] no proof that Andrew Allen "collaborated" with Bullock or that he even knew Bullock. As a matter of fact, Allen says he never met Bullock and doesn't recall ever hearing Bullock's name until Bullock was outed by The Chronicle last year.

That is, either Andrew Allen is not telling me the truth, or WC's charges against him are untrue. How can this difficult impasse be broken? All WC has to do is publish proof that Allen is an ADL agent. It's not complicated. WC should have presented such proof when he published the allegation. That would have been the honorable thing to do. That would have been an act of integrity. Since he didn't, I'm going to speculate that WC has no proof for the allegation. That WC has decided to smear Andrew Allen to further his struggle to regain his authority with IHR., and that his charges are a mix of speculation and slander, a bucket of Carto spit.

I don't ask Willis to do anything about his accusations against Andrew Allen that revisionists do not ask Jews and others to do with respect to their accusations about Germans using gassing chambers--put up or shut up. Either Willis Carto has proof that Andrew Allen is a mole for the ADL or Willis Carto is a slanderer. The ball's in his court.

If Willis does publish information that substantiates his charges against Andrew Allen, you will have gotten an interesting insight into my credulity, my misplaced sense of friendship, and my unworthiness of being trusted or respected by those who represent and support The Institute for Historical Review.

If Willis does not publish the facts proving that Andrew is an ADL mole, you will understand something of his intellectual vulgarity, the crudeness of his sensibilities under pressure, and much of what you need to know about why he should have been excised from any relationship with IHR and The Journal years ago.

WILLIS CARTO VS. HIMSELF

Willis is four or five years older than me, he must be nearing seventy now, and the end of his life is approaching. It's time for him to take stock of how he relates to people, how he treats those who work with him, to ask forgiveness here and there, to get a grip on his real life, to put something before what he is putting first now.

I would urge Willis to come clean about the "Edison" bequest of millions of dollars, which court documents and WC's own sworn statements make clear was left to IHR but which has apparently been diverted to private and even secret accounts controlled by Willis. If he doesn't come clean about the money, he's never going to be able to clean up his life. I don't know if he is able to understand an idea like this one, but I wish him well, and I urge him to contemplate the fact that his time is about to come, and that he's only going to have one chance to do it right.

THE CAMPUS PROJECT IN PRESS CLIPPINGS

We have some 150 pages of press clippings produced by the Campus Project this academic year. We're putting together a portfolio of these press stories. I suppose it will cost about $15 each to have them copied, packaged and mailed. Those of you who have helped with the Project this season will receive the portfolio in June. We'll send it to you for a contribution of $20 (or more?).

Just as a $288 advertisement might cost a university $2-million (reported below by The Hurricane at U of Miami) the ads in their totality have produced many millions of dollars worth of public notice for revisionism. In the last three years holocaust revisionism has become part of our cultural landscape. The Campus Project is responsible for most of it. At the same time, I am under no illusion that we can simply repeat next academic year what we we did this. There has to be a new approach--and there will be. The wheels for it are already in motion. A lot of people on the other side are going to be taken aback. You're going to like it. A lot!

Best wishes,

Brad

The Miami Hurricane 13 April 1994

Cries of betrayal greet running of Holocaust ad

Students have right to be wrong, UM provost says

By FRANCES ROBLES
Herald Staff Writer

Luis Glaser stood before a throng of angry Jews who saw him as the traitor among them.

As provost of the University of Miami, he had the unenviable task on Tuesday of explaining to 200 protesting students why the administration didn't veto a student newspaper ad that questioned proof that the Holocaust occurred.

Glaser's argument: academic freedom.

Across town at an enormous Key Biscayne condo overlooking the ocean, millionaire Sanford L. Ziff got more than 100 phone calls congratulating him as a hero who stood up for Jews.

A philanthropist with deep pockets, Ziff felt it was his job to let UM suffer the consequences for permitting the ad to run Tuesday. The day before, the Sunglass Hut founder had withdrawn a pledged $2 million donation to UM's Lowe Art Gallery and its Sylvester Cancer Research Center.

All over a $288 quarter-page ad.

The two men are Jews on different sides of a stormy issue: Whether UM administrators should have allowed student editors at The Miami Hurricane to run an ad that questions whether the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum offers any proof that Jews were gassed during World War II.

It was placed by Bradley R. Smith, a 64-year-old California writer who places ads in student papers around the country.

The drama climaxed Tuesday at UM, when hun-

Smith's Report is published six times a year and sent free to those who help with contributions, relevant press clippings or in other ways. I welcome correspondence and read it all, but [forgive me] can not respond unless it address urgent business to hand.

Your generosity is the cornerstone of whatever progress I will continue to make in having revisionist research judged on its merits.

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO

Bradley R. Smith
PO Box 3267 Visalia CA 93278
Tel/Fax: (209) 733 2653